



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,996	01/30/2004	Suresh C. Srivastava		4523

Indu M. Anand
15 Green Way
Chelmsford, MA 01824

7590

07/29/2009

EXAMINER

FETTEROLF, BRANDON J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/20/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/768,996

Applicant(s)

SRIVASTAVA ET AL.

Examiner

BRANDON J. FETTEROLF

Art Unit

1642

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 25-37 and 45-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on 6/26/2009 in response to the Non-Final office action of 2/26/2008 is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 1-23 and 25-50 are pending.

Claims 38-44 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 1-23, 25-37 and 45-50 are currently under consideration.

Specification

The disclosure remains objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification remain objected to, see for example page 3 of the specification that begins on line 18, for improper disclosure of nucleotide sequences without a respective sequence identifier, i.e. a SEQ ID NOs. Hence, the disclosure fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825. In the absence of a sequence identifier for each sequence, Applicant must provide a computer readable form (CRF) copy of the sequence listing, an initial or substitute paper copy of the sequence listing, as well as any amendment directing its entry into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e-f) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

Note: Applicants amendment to the specification filed on 10/16/2004 is acknowledged which incorporated Sequence identifiers to SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. However, in view of the Applicants amendments submitted on 12/20/2007 which included a revised sequence listing, SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 have been deleted.

The use of the trademarks, for example Gemicitabine, has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

Rejections Maintained:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-23 and 25-37 remain rejected and new claims 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the claims encompass an oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells comprising at least two CPG moieties and a prodrug for an antimetabolite covalently linked to the oligonucleotide. Therefore, the claims encompass a genus of oligonucleotides.

The Written Description Guidelines for examination of patent applications indicates, “the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical characteristics and/or other chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.” (Federal register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3) and (see MPEP 2164).

The specification teaches (page 5) that oligonucleotides of the invention include oligonucleotides which preferentially kill cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells and comprise at least two CpG moieties. In particular, the specification teaches that oligonucleotides for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells have a motif represented by the formula: 5'PGXCG3', wherein P is a prodrug for an antimetabolite and X represents between 0 and 50 nucleotides, preferably 2, 5 or 9 nucleotides (page 7). For example, the specification provides a number of oligonucleotide sequences (page 20).

The state of the prior art at the time the invention was made recognized the therapeutic potential of CpG oligodeoxynucleotides for immunotherapy. For example, Weiner (Leukocyte Biology, 2000; 68: 455-463) indicates that there is therapeutic potential in cancer treatment for CpG as an immune adjuvant (Table 1) and that there are a number of scenarios where CpG could be used as a component of cancer immunotherapy, each of these areas is under intensive investigation (p. 458, col. 1). Studies in a tumor model (38C13 murine lymphoma) indicate that CpG was just as effective as CFA at inducing an antigen-specific antibody response (p. 458, col. 2). Weiner teaches that "[P]reliminary studies suggest CpG ODN can be effective in a variety of scenarios when used alone or in combination with other agents. Despite this promise we still do not understand the molecular mechanisms responsible for the immunostimulatory effects of CpG ODN. All CpG ODN are not alike, and more needs to be learned about the heterogeneous responses that occur based on host organism, cell subset, or CpG ODN sequence. Most importantly, we have not yet explored their clinical effects. Further work with CpG ODN in both the laboratory and the clinic is needed before we can know their true promise as investigational immunological and therapeutic agents." (p. 461, col. 1) Krieg et al (Nature 1995; 374: 546-549) teaches that CpG has NK-stimulating properties and suggest that it can be used in immunotherapy of tumors, yet Krieg et al also indicates that many or even most types of tumors are relatively resistant to NK-mediated lysis (p. 117, col. 2). Ballas et al (J. Immunology 2001; 167: 4878) teaches that the selection of optimal CpG ODN for cancer immunotherapy depends upon a careful analysis of the cellular specificities of various CpG motifs and an understanding of the cellular mechanisms responsible for the antitumor activity in a particular tumor (abstract). Ballas et al teaches that a single CpG ODN cannot be used to treat all cancers and tumors. Although several CpG ODN were active as sole immunotherapeutic agents in two tumor models, different motifs were optimal in each model. CpG ODN 1585 was optimal against B 16 melanoma and its effects were dependent on NK cells. CpG ODN 1826 was optimal in a lymphoma model and its effects appeared to require NK (early) and T cells (late). These results illustrate that the potent distinct CpG motifs can be custom-tailored for each desired immune effect (p. 4878, col. 2; see also p. 4885, col. 1). Agrawal et al (TRENDS in Molecular Medicine, 2002, 8/3:114-120) also teaches that different effects are observed with different CpG ODNs. However, the prior art appears to be silent on preferential killing of cancer cells over non-cancerous cells by CpG containing oligonucleotides or the structural requirements necessary for this function.

In the instant case, the structure of the oligonucleotide comprising at least two CpG moieties is vast in view of the recitation of the open claim language of “comprising” which indicates that there are other structural components to the claimed oligonucleotides. However, the structures of the additional nucleic acids in the oligonucleotides are not known. The oligonucleotides recited in the pending claimed genus would not clearly apprise one skilled in the art that the inventors of the claimed genus and all species encompassed thereby as of the filing date. The structures of these oligonucleotides has not been specifically defined. The claims recite that the oligonucleotide comprise at least two CpG moieties. However, the function of the other oligonucleotides is not known. The claims do not set forth the specific structure of the claimed oligonucleotide and it is not clear if the claims or specification give the structure and function of the oligonucleotide, as required by written description guidelines.

It is noted that the claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described where an invention is described solely in terms of a method of its making coupled with its function and there is no described or art-recognized correlation or relationship between the structure of the invention and its function. A biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence. An adequate written description of a chemical invention also requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, and not merely a wish or plan for obtaining the chemical invention claimed.

A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559,1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a “laundry list” disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not “reasonably lead” those skilled in the art to any particular species); *In re Ruschig*, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967) (“Ifn-propylamine had been used in making the compound instead of n-butylamine, the compound of claim 13 would have resulted. Appellants submit to us, as they did to the board, an imaginary specific example patterned on specific example 6 by which the above butyl compound is made so that we can see what a simple change would have resulted in a specific supporting disclosure being

present in the present specification. The trouble is that there is no such disclosure, easy though it is to imagine it.") (emphasis in original); *Purdue Pharma L.P.v. Faulding Inc.*, 230 F.3d 1320, 1328, 56 USPQ2d 1481, 1487 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("the specification does not clearly disclose to the skilled artisan that the inventors ... considered the ratio., to be part of their invention There is therefore no force to Purdue's argument that the written description requirement was satisfied because the disclosure revealed a broad invention from which the [later-filed] claims carved out a patentable portion").

The claims are drawn to a vast genus of oligonucleotides. To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention.

MPEP § 2163.02 states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, 'does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed' ". The courts have decided: The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, whatever is now claimed. See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "'Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was

complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of variant species, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The introduction of claim changes which involve narrowing the claims by introducing elements or limitations which are not supported by the as-filed disclosure is a violation of the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); *In re Ruschig*, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967) ("Ifn-propylamine had been used in making the compound instead ofn-butylamine, the compound of claim 13 would have resulted. Appellants submit to us, as they did to the board, an imaginary specific example patterned on specific example 6 by which the above butyl compound is made so that we can see what a simple change would have resulted in a specific supporting disclosure being present in the present specification. The trouble is that there is no such disclosure, easy though it is to imagine it.") (emphasis in original). *In Ex parte Ohshiro*, 14 USPQ2d 1750 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), the Board affirmed the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, of claims to an internal combustion engine which recited "at least one of said piston and said cylinder (head) having a recessed channel." The Board held that the application, which disclosed a cylinder head with a recessed channel and a piston without a recessed channel did not specifically disclose the "species" of a channeled piston.

In response to this rejection, Applicants contend that by rewriting claim 1 as a method claim for assembling the oligonucleotides for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells

they have addressed these concerns. Moreover, Applicants contend that for the method of the present invention, the number of oligonucleotides used in such as combination is of no consequence.

These arguments have been carefully considered, but are not found persuasive.

In the present case, the Examiner acknowledges Applicants rewriting claim 1 as a method claim for assembling oligonucleotides for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells. However, it is unclear how the amendment overcomes the rejection. For example, as noted above, the claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described where an invention is described solely in terms of a method of its making coupled with its function and there is no described or art-recognized correlation or relationship between the structure of the invention and its function. In the present case, the claims are drawn to a vast genus of oligonucleotides. To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention.

New Rejections Necessitated by Amendment:

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-23, 25-37 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites a method of synthesizing an oligonucleotide product for preferentially

killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells comprising the steps of: (a) using a first oligonucleotide comprising a nucleotide sequence, N, and with at least CpG moieties; and (b) covalently linking one or more units of an antimetabolite prodrug to said first oligonucleotide. Claims 2 and 3, for example, further limit the antimetabolite to a specific compound such as 2'-deoxy, 2',2'-difluorocytidine. New claims 45-48 further limit the prodrug to antimetabolite 2'-deoxy, 2',2'-difluorocytidine. As such, it is unclear whether the prodrug of an antimetabolite, as recited in claim 1, is 2'-deoxy, 2',2'-difluorocytidine or the antimetabolite itself is 2'-deoxy, 2',2'-difluorocytidine.

Claims 1-23, 25-37 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the claims are inclusive of a genus of antimetabolite prodrugs.

The Written Description Guidelines for examination of patent applications indicates, "the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical characteristics and/or other chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicant was in possession of the claimed genus." (Federal register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3) and (see MPEP 2164).

The specification teaches (paragraph 0013) the invention provides an oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells, comprising at least two CpG moieties and a prodrug for an antimetabolite covalently linked to the oligonucleotide. In one embodiment, the antimetabolite is selected from the group consisting of 2'-deoxy-3'-thiacytidine, 3'-azido-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-dideoxycytidine, 2',3'-didehydro-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-dideoxyinosine, 5-fluoro-2'-deoxy uridine, 2-fluoro-9-b-D-arabinofuranosyladenine, 1-B-D-arabinofuranosylcytosine, 5-azacytidine, 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine, 6-mercaptapurineriboside, 2-chlorodeoxyadenosine, and pentostatin. In another embodiment, it is selected from 2'-deoxy-3'-thiacytidine, 3'-azido-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-didehydro-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-dideoxyinosine, 5-fluoro-2'-deoxyuridine,

2-fluoro-9-b-D-arabinofuranosyladenine, 1-B-D-arabinofuranosylcytosine 5-azacytidine, 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine, 6-mercaptapurineriboside, 6-thioguanosine, 2-chlorodeoxyadenosine, pentostatin, and 2'-deoxy, 2',2'-difluorocytosine. The specification further provides 4 sequences comprising d'-deoxy,2',2'-difluorocytidine linked to a CpG sequence (page 54, Lines 14-20). Thus, while the specification reasonably conveys 2'-deoxy-3'-thiacytidine, 3'-azido-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-dideoxycytidine, 2',3'-didehydro-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-dideoxyinosine, 5-fluoro-2'-deoxy uridine, 2-fluoro-9-b-D-arabinofuranosyladenine, 1-B-D-arabinofuranosylcytosine, 5-azacytidine, 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine, 6-mercaptapurineriboside, 2-chlorodeoxyadenosine, and pentostatin. In another embodiment, it is selected from 2'-deoxy-3'-thiacytidine, 3'-azido-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-didehydro-3'-deoxythymidine, 2',3'-dideoxyinosine, 5-fluoro-2'-deoxyuridine, 2-fluoro-9-b-D-arabinofuranosyladenine, 1-B-D-arabinofuranosylcytosine 5-azacytidine, 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine, 6-mercaptapurineriboside, 6-thioguanosine, 2-chlorodeoxyadenosine, pentostatin, and 2'-deoxy, 2',2'-difluorocytosine linked to a CpG containing sequence, the specification does not appear to be commensurate in scope with the claimed invention was encompass's any prodrug of an antimetabolite, including the antimetabolite itself (see claim 3 and claim 47 for comparison). A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or by describing structural features common to the genus that "constitute a substantial portion of the genus." See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 1568, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997): "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cNDA, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus." The Federal Circuit has recently clarified that a DNA molecule can be adequately described without disclosing its complete structure. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc., 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Enzo court adopted the standard that the written description requirement can be met by "show[ing] that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristicsi.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics. " Id. At 1324, 63 USPQ2d at 1613 (emphasis omitted, bracketed material in original).

The court has since clarified that this standard applies to compounds other than cDNAs. See University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., Inc., ___ F.3d ___, 2004 WL 260813, at *9 (Fed.Cir.Feb. 13, 2004). The instant specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features that are common to the genus. That is, the specification provides neither a representative number of antimetabolite prodrugs that encompass the genus nor does it provide a description of structural features that are common to the genus. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, the disclosure is insufficient to describe the genus. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe and enable the genus as broadly claimed.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure(s) of the encompassed genus of antimetabolite prodrugs, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Therefore, No claim is found allowable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. FETTEROLF whose telephone number is (571)272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1642

Application/Control Number: 10/768,996

Page 13

Art Unit: 1642

/Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642